



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and English thinkers (Professor Hobhouse); the broad likenesses in European education throughout the changes of its history from the old scholastic to the humanistic and later to the scientific ideal (J. W. Headlam); the almost universal desire for social reform, the modern social conscience everywhere ill at ease and seeking to put the dispossessed into possession (C. Delisle Burns); the common interests of finance, trade, and exchange, and the conflicts that arise over such exchange (Hartley Withers). The last-named writer has a happy gift for describing an economic situation with great fairness, terseness, and simplicity. "The individuals become mutually dependent and live by one another's production. Hence comes unity," he says, describing the division of labor and the growth of trade, but then he adds, "and with it a fresh cause of dissension owing to the likelihood of quarrelling over the exchange effected." A balanced statement singularly appropriate to our present distressful condition. Mr. Wood, at the other end of man's scale of values, deals with religion. He does not minimise the conflict of creeds but he emphasizes, and in an inspiring fashion, the sense of unity shown by the Western belief in the solidarity of mankind and in the progress towards a common end. "Toleration" he holds to be "an essential element of the Christian character" and a "deep respect for individuality . . . to be at the centre of the gospel." Because in every individual there is believed to be a divine element leading to truth.

It is obvious that the book is packed with matter. All the essays are valuable, and some of them, beside being pregnant in themselves are singularly well-suited for an introduction to the subject.

F. M. STAWELL.

London.

THE POLITICAL WRITINGS OF JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU. Edited from the original manuscripts, with Introduction and Notes, by C. E. Vaughan, M.A., Litt.D. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. £3 3s. 0d. Vol. I., pp. xxii, 516; vol. II., pp. iv, 577.

A complete and scholarly edition of Rousseau's political writings is of good omen. Nothing could better supply the peculiar needs of the present. We are indebted to Dr. Vaughan

Vol. XXVI.—No. 4. 8

for work which is both useful at the moment and will undoubtedly prove of permanent importance.

He has given us the full and carefully corrected texts of Rousseau's political treatises together with illustrative passages from the *Emile*. A review is added of the state of the manuscripts, all of which Dr. Vaughan has collated at least twice. The true extent of the labour involved can hardly be measured by the careful corrections and the interesting notes on textual exactness of which the edition is full. We feel that we have the real Rousseau, both in the two renderings of the *Contrat Social*, in the political letters and in those most inspiring fragments *L'État de guerre*, and the *Jugement sur la paix perpétuelle*. And the real Rousseau for us now means something very valuable, if we consider that we, too, may be living on the eve of a social revolution. Prophecy is futile; but even if nothing new comes out of the present political confusion, much new thinking will have to be done. Rousseau stands for a freshness of outlook which is not gained by a too easy repudiation of the work of past thinkers: and a very clear sense of his modernity must have originally urged Dr. Vaughan to give us the whole of Rousseau's political teaching. His educational theory is the most difficult part of his work to omit when one is considering his political writings; but in the end we have to acknowledge Rousseau's greatness even in the most restricted sense of the theory of political society.

In addition to Rousseau's work we have, in this edition, Dr. Vaughan's own comments. To begin at the end,—Dr. Vaughan in his second appendix to the second volume has given us a paper, based upon Mrs. MacDonald's work, which deals with Rousseau as a man. His character is admirably and, to my mind convincingly rendered. Clearly the idea of a "conversion" explains much in Rousseau; and the calumnies from which Rousseau's reputation has suffered are completely exposed. This perhaps corrects the limitation of the older view of Rousseau's moral character which even Lord Morley accepted.

But naturally what is newest and most interesting in these volumes is the general view which Dr. Vaughan takes of Rousseau's political theory. The discussion of Rousseau's political thought turns on an old contrast between individualism and collectivism. Dr. Vaughan makes him the exponent of an extreme collectivism. It is recognised that the suppositions with

which he had to begin his work were individualistic in the eighteenth century sense. The *Discours* is mainly a protest against evil, based on a mistaken and abstract theory of the individual divorced from any community; and as a social protest, it did not express any clear or new political idea. When we come to the body of the *Contrat Social* the guiding conceptions as well as the general argument are collectivist. The individual is "annihilated": he is totally "surrendered"; and his separate personality is replaced by the "collective self" of the community as a whole. This involves state-absolutism, although the state is to Rousseau the people and not the king. Dr. Vaughan says that Rousseau was willing to go to that extreme. He was impressed, no doubt, by the immense debt the individual owes to his group, by the obvious fact that the individual of eighteenth century theory did not exist, and most of all by the need of some strong power to overthrow the established personal despotisms of Europe. The "general will" appears as sovereign. There are, however, corrections in Rousseau which Dr. Vaughan sees in the emphasis put upon the free and reasonable individual as the source of political power. In spite of the ideal of unity and strength, Rousseau never lost his conception of liberty. And when we turn from Dr. Vaughan's Introduction, written before the war, to his Epilogue, written after war had begun, we incline to smile. Rousseau is still collectivist: but violently contrasted with such an absolutist as Fichte. We read (vol. II, p. 522) that "with all his austerity the individualist in Rousseau was never wholly exorcised by the collectivist." I do not quite see why an individualist should be regarded as a demon: and I incline to dispute the validity of Dr. Vaughan's idea as to where the emphasis really lies in Rousseau's political theory. But I confess that so long as we speak of an eternal conflict between the "moi-humain" and the "moi-commun," between the individual and the "corporate self," it does not very much matter which is exorcist and which demon.

In the other great issue dealt with by Rousseau, that of the relation between states, Dr. Vaughan admirably estimates the excellence of Rousseau's practical suggestions without being blind to his limitations. Some of these were, of course, inherited. But perhaps Dr. Vaughan does not sufficiently emphasise what appears to be a very great limitation still existing in all such discussions. I presume that the relation between states, even more

than the relation of citizens to their state, will be the subject most debated in the near future. In Rousseau's time, also, war gave much food for thought. Rousseau calls war and tyranny the two greatest scourges of mankind. But how is war to be avoided? The plan of a confederation is undoubtedly good. But Rousseau hardly saw—and Dr. Vaughan does not point out this fact—that it was not mainly a question of political machinery. The danger of writing upon the state is that the writer begins to think that what is not the state is nothing. Rousseau's ideas hardly go beyond a state arrangement. And no suggestion as to the future is even now likely to be effective if the problem is dealt with as though it concerned only the limitations of sovereignty. Rousseau too much identified human society with political institutions. But for all his deficiencies and in spite of the omissions which Dr. Vaughan was perhaps obliged to allow in his excellent commentary, these two volumes are full of suggestion for our present needs. The ultimate issue for theory is, no doubt, what Dr. Vaughan makes it. How are we to consider the relationships of men in society? Are we to be individualists or collectivists? And is the theory of collectivism what we chiefly owe to Rousseau? This is not the place to discuss in detail either Rousseau's position or that obviously adopted by Dr. Vaughan. It is sufficient to say that one may possibly put aside altogether the old controversy in acknowledging our greatest debt to Jean Jacques. I admit that Dr. Vaughan is entirely right in saying that Rousseau's great contribution was the social idea. Indeed I should have said that he is known as a collectivist and not as an individualist. I do not know about the English interpretations. But Taine makes it his complaint that Rousseau only transferred the obsolete sanctity of despotic government to democratic government. Renan and, in our own day, Émile Faguet make the same sort of judgment. But Dr. Vaughan does not deal with the recent French criticism of Rousseau. The fundamental point for me is that Rousseau is too great to be either collectivist or individualist. Happily he had scientific exactness without losing artistic perception. So long as one contrasts the two "isms," one has the uncomfortable feeling that our disputes about the state will sound to our grandchildren like the mediæval disputes concerning the intelligence of angels. To be vastly moved as to whether the state should aim chiefly at "self-preservation" involves a blindness to the unmystical fact that it

is you and I who are called upon to defend it. If it could defend itself or indeed if it had any self to defend, the state might be absolute for all I know. If angels think, they may very well think as Aquinas will have it that they do. What really we want to know is how we "unfeathered bipeds with gregarious habits," as Plato has excellently called us, may best arrange our lives so as to get more out of them than we do or than our fathers did. The established arrangements have been named, by some Adam who was present at creation, state and church and the rest; but he had not a good eye, and he took animals for angels and gatherings for disembodied intelligences. Even our modern scientists leave one unconvinced. I cannot reduce the state to pounds, shillings and pence. I can only see men, women and children. This sense for reality, as it appears to me, I find in Rousseau. This and not any theory of limited individualism or moderate collectivism makes him valuable in an age in which institutions have become so vast that man himself loses his humanity. What we need, and what I think Dr. Vaughan sees that we need, is not chiefly security for the state or freedom for the citizen, not collectivism or individualism, but political humanism: and the father of that is Jean Jacques, who himself owed it to the greatest of our ancestors, Plato.

C. DELISLE BURNS.

London, England.

THE INEQUALITY OF HUMAN RACES. By Arthur de Gobineau. Translated by Adrian Collins, M.A., with an introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy. London: Heinemann, 1915. Pp. ix, 220.

The translation of Count de Gobineau's famous work, especially in such a competent and charming version as this, is a not inopportune event. For in its decisive simplicity and vigour, it stands for one answer to the question which no one can avoid asking just at present,—What is the meaning of this breakdown in civilization? Gobineau's answer is that it has no meaning at all, none at least if by 'meaning' we imply any kind of value. There is meaning enough in it as a natural fact, as one incident in that conflict of races which is the whole history of civilization. But no moral or political or religious principle is at stake, here or anywhere. There is one inexorable law governing this conflict and governing every movement in human history—that